## Remarks

## A. The Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 33, 35 and 40 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 13, 21, 30 and 38 of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,513 to Scott et al.

Concurrently filed herewith is a terminal disclaimer filed in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). Therefore the obviousness-type doubled patenting rejection of claims 33, 35 and 40 is overcome. *See* 37 CFR 1.130(b). Favorable reconsideration is requested.

## B. Conclusion

In view of the concurrently-filed terminal disclaimer, claims 33-90 are allowable. Therefore, Applicants submit that all claims of the pending application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and claims is courteously solicited.

Attached is a check in the amount of \$130.00 for the Terminal Disclaimer To Obviate A Double Patenting Rejection Over A Prior Patent. Should any additional fees under 37 CRF 1.16-1.21 be required for any reason relating to the enclosed materials, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from O'Keefe, Egan & Peterman Deposit Account No. 10-1205/SILA:002C4.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3), the Commissioner is authorized to treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.126(a) to be timely, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time, and the Commissioner is authorized to deduct any requisite extension of time fees under 37 CFR 1.16 to 1.21 from Deposit Account No. 10-1205/ SILA:002C4.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (512)-347-1611 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

William W. Enders Reg. No. 41,735

Attorney for Applicants

O'Keefe, Egan & Peterman, LLP 1101 S. Capital of Texas Highway Building C, Suite 200 Austin, Texas 78746 512/347-1611 FAX 512/347-1615